REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Amendments

Claim 7 has been amended mainly for clarity. Claims 8 – 12 and 17 have been amended in view of the amendments to claim 1. No new matter has been added.

35 USC §102

The Final Office Action dated January 8, 2009, states that the Applicant's claims were rejected on the grounds that Ayaki et al. (U.S. Patent 6,934,464) anticipates the claims. However, the cited passages originate from Yuen et al. (U.S. Patent 5,488,409). A brief interview was held between Nicholas Witchey and the Examiner regarding the inconsistency of the cited reference. The Examiner indicated that Yuen is the proper reference.

The Office rejected claims 7 - 12, and 17 - 18 under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Yuen (5,488,409). The Applicant respectfully disagrees, especially in view of the amendments entered herein. Both claim 7 and 18 include the feature that a new video frame can be displayed nearly instantaneously while playing a different, non-sequential frame. The approach provided the by Applicants specifically allows for cueing a new frame (page 4, lines 5 - 9) with little latency. Claim 7 encompasses this concept by claiming (a) storing two non-sequential compress video frames in non-contiguous memory locations, and (b) cueing one of the frames within single frame latency. For example, when video is played at about 30 frames a second, the single frame latency would be one thirtieth of a second. Claim 18 also encompasses the concept by claiming that a single frame in a video sequence of nine of more frames can be located, accessed, and played back "... within a <u>single frame latency time</u> while playing back any one of the other video frames" (emphasis added).

Yuen simply lacks all the elements in claims 7 and 18 as claimed. For example, Yuen lacks any teaching for accessing non-sequential frames in a video sequence in a nearly instantaneous fashion (e.g., within a latency of one frame time). Claims 7 and 18 are allowable over Yuen, among other reasons, on the grounds that Yuen fails to teach all the elements of the respective claims. Claims 8 – 12 and 17 are also allowable by virtue of their dependence on claim 1.

Request For Allowance

 $Claims \, 7-12, \, 17, \, 18 \ are pending in this application. \ The applicant requests allowance of all pending claims.$

Respectfully submitted, Fish & Associates, PC

Date: February 6, 2009 By: <u>/Robert D. Fish/</u>
Robert D. Fish
Rcg. No. 33880

Fish & Associates, PC 2603 Main Street, Suite 1050 Irvine, CA 92614-6232 Telephone (949) 253-0944 Fax (949) 253-9069